



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/329,923	06/10/1999	FABRICE AGNES	005974/0010	8774

27383 7590 02/13/2003

CLIFFORD CHANCE US LLP
200 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10166

EXAMINER

SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/329923

Applicant(s)

Aghes et al

Examiner

Sax

Group Art Unit

2174

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/18/02
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper et al (5729673) and Bronfeld et al (6308144)

4. Regarding claim 1, Cooper et al show the software control method for forming a two dimensional view of a computer defined graphical model (Figure 5, column 1 lines 34-45), generating a drawing data item associated with a component of the two dimensional view (column 4 lines 35-53, column 5 lines 5-16), adding the drawing item to the view responsive to user activation (column 5 lines 15-37). Cooper et al do not specifically describe forming a user interface to control the addition, but do mention convenient ways to edit the model using an interface (column 5 lines 37-55). Furthermore, Bronfeld et al do show forming the separate sketcher plane interface to add a drawing item to a model (column 10 lines 49-67). This is done

Art Unit: 2174

fore convenient editing of the model. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this feature in Cooper et al, because it would provide a convenient way to edit a model.

5. Regarding claim 2, Bronfeld et al show that the drawing feature is a dimension (column 10 lines 50-65).

6. Regarding claims 3-4, the drawing item is added after an expiration time if the system is not paused (Cooper et al column 4 lines 35-50).

7. Regarding claim 5, the item is modified (Cooper et al column 5 lines 38-57).

8. Regarding claim 6, a drwing item is deleted and will not appear in the subsequent views (Bronfeld et al abstract, column 15 lines 15-42, column 16 lines 33-50).

9. Regarding claim 7, the drawing item is stopped and an additional view is formed (Bronfeld et al column 16 lines 43-65).

10. Regarding claim 8, a modification is reproduced in a two dimensional view (Bronfeld et al column 16 lines 42-65).

Art Unit: 2174

11. Regarding claim 9, the drawing item may ne added automatically or with user intervention (column 16 lines 1-22).
12. Regarding claims 10-12, the drawing mode may be paused in which a user may modify data and generate data (Bronfeld et al column 16 lines 33-55).
13. Regarding claims 13-14, drawing data views may be filtered from being formed (column 16 lines 50-65 of Bronfeld et al).
14. Claims 15-23 show the same features as above and are rejected for the same reasons.
15. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. But note that the double patenting rejection has been removed.
16. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Steve Sax at telephone number (703) 305-9582.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Sax whose telephone number is (703) 305-9582. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.


Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238	After Final Communication
(703) 746-7239	Official Communication
(703) 746-7420	For Status Inquiries, draft communication

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


STEVEN SAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER